

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto is a replacement figure sheet for Figure 9B, which includes the changes, without markings, identified below.

Figure 9B has been amended to replace the non-English characters with --
Pumping--.

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 3 is cancelled and claims 1, 2, 4-20 and 56 are amended. Claims 33-55 have been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4-32 and 56 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 21-32 have been withdrawn from further consideration. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-20 and 56 are currently active in this application, of which claim 1 is independent.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested because it places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. In view of the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

First, in this response, claim 1 has been amended to further recite “an in-line convey unit conveying the substrates in the in-line system”, as elected previously and as suggested by the Examiner.

Second, the Examiner asserted that “added limitations of claims 2-20 and 56 ... are not patentably distinct per Applicant’s admission” (Office Action, page 7). This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

Previously, the Examiner stated “Inventions I-XI” are *mutually unrelated* in the Restriction/Election Requirement mailed on December 15, 2003. In the Reply filed on

May 20, 2004, Applicants asserted that the inventions defined in claims 2-20 and 56 are not *independent* and *distinct* from the invention defined in claim 1, in terms of the Restriction Requirement.

Applicants have not stated that claims 2-20 and 56 are not patentably distinct from claim 1. Instead, Applicants argued that “the invention defined in claims 2-20 and 56 cannot be “distinct” from claim 1” (page 5, lines 1-2) because “the Examiner has not established that the invention defined in claim 1 is patentable over any of the inventions defined in claim 2-20 and 56” (page 4 to page 5).

The Examiner has not withdrawn his position that “Inventions I-XI” are *mutually unrelated*”, which is inconsistent and conflicting with the Examiner’s other position that claims 2-20 and 56 are not patentably distinct from claim 1. Thus, the Examiner’s clarification is respectfully requested.

DRAWING OBJECTION

The drawings were objected to because Fig. 9B includes non-English characters. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, Fig. 9B has been amended to replace these characters with --Pumping--, as shown in the attached drawing sheet.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 1 is objected to for being drawn to non-elected claims. This objection is respectfully traversed at least for the following reason.

As mentioned above, claim 1 has been amended to further recite "an in-line convey unit conveying the substrates in the in-line system", as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,978,065 issued to Kawasumi, *et al.* ("Kawasumi") in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 56114928 by Adachi ("Adachi"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 3. Amended claim 1 recites "a sealant heat-treating unit forming a reaction-prevention layer on a surface of the sealant to prevent a reaction between the sealant and a liquid crystal material".

In this regard, the asserted combination of Kawasumi and Adachi fails to disclose or suggest forming a reaction-prevention layer on the surface of the sealant to prevent reaction between the sealant and a liquid crystal material. Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over them. Claims 2, 4-20 and 56 are dependent from claim 1 and hence would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-20 and 56.

Claims 1-20 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasumi in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,680,759 issued to Ogawa ("Ogawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the following reasons.

This application claims priority from Korean Patent Application No. 2000-21079, which was filed on April 20, 2000. Ogawa was filed on February 7, 2001. Since the priority date of the present application antedates Ogawa's filing date, Ogawa does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-20 and 56.

OTHER MATTERS

In addition to the amendments mentioned above, claims 1, 2, 4-20 and 56 are amended for better wording and clarification. Also, these claims are amended to delete certain limitations that appear to be unnecessarily limiting the claim scope. These amendments are not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments.


CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Richard D. Shachar, Reg. No. 48,342, F02
Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 10, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

ATTACHMENT: (a) Corrected Drawings
 (b) English translation of verified copy of priority documents
 (c) Statement verifying accuracy of translation

\\COM\510395.1